arXiv:1407.4184v1 [stat.ME] 16 Jul 2014

Inference for biased models: a quasi-instrumental variable approach

Lu Lin, Lixing Zhu* and Yujie Gai

Abstract

For linear regression models who are not exactly sparse in the sense that the coefficients of the insignificant variables are not exactly zero, the working models obtained by a variable selection are often biased. Even in sparse cases, after a variable selection, when some significant variables are missing, the working models are biased as well. Thus, under such situations, root-n consistent estimation and accurate prediction could not be expected. In this paper, a novel remodelling method is proposed to produce an unbiased model when quasi-instrumental variables are introduced. The root-n estimation consistency and the asymptotic normality can be achieved, and the prediction accuracy can be promoted as well. The performance of the new method is examined through simulation studies.

Keywords. High-dimensional regression, non-sparse structure, instrumental variable, re-modeling, bias correction, Dantzig selector.

Running head. Non-sparse regressions.

*The corresponding author: lzhu@hkbu.edu.hk. Lu Lin is a professor of Shandong University Qilu Securities Institute for Financial Studies and the School of Mathematics at Shandong University, Jinan, China. His research was supported by NNSF project (11171188 and 11231005) of China, Mathematical Finance-Backward Stochastic Analysis and Computations in Financial Risk Control of China (11221061), NSF and SRRF projects (ZR2010AZ001 and BS2011SF006) of Shandong Province of China and K C Wong-HKBU Fellowship Programme for Mainland China Scholars 2010-11. Lixing Zhu is a Chair professor of Department of Mathematics at Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong, China. He was supported by a grant from the University Grants Council of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China. Yujie Gai is an assistant professor at Central University of Finance and Economics, Beijing, China. Her research was supported by NNSF project (11201499) of China. The first two authors are in charge of the methodology development and material organization.

1 Introduction

The research described here is particularly motivated by variable selection, but not limited to this area. Consider the linear regression model:

$$Y = \beta^\tau X + \varepsilon. \tag{1.1}$$

The model is seen as the full model that contains all possibly relevant predictors $X^{(1)}, \cdots, X^{(p)}$ in the predictor vector X, implying $E(\varepsilon|X) = 0$. Here the dimension p of X is large and even larger than the size n of an available sample. As is well known, the root-n estimation consistency and the asymptotic normality play very important role for further data analyses such as confidence region and prediction interval constructions. However, when there are too many predictors, that is, when p is too large, even $p > n$, the root-n estimation consistency is often impossible, and prediction could be inaccurate. Variable selection is necessary for us to use those "kept predictors" in a working model such that the data analyses can go forward. As such, variable selection is usually used to remove other predictors out from the full model. We will call them the "removed predictors". Without loss of generality, suppose that the first q predictors, $X^{(1)}, \cdots, X^{(q)}$, are kept in a working model whereas the last $p - q$ predictors are removed from the full model (1.1) via a variable selection approach. X is then partitioned to be $X = (Z^\tau, U^\tau)^\tau$, where $Z = (X^{(1)}, \cdots, X^{(q)})^\tau$ and $U = (X^{(q+1)}, \cdots, X^{(p)})^\tau$. Correspondingly, β is partitioned as $\beta = (\theta^\tau, \gamma^\tau)^\tau$. Thus, the working model is the following post-selection model:

$$Y = \theta^\tau Z + \eta, \tag{1.2}$$

where η is a new error term. Here working model means that after selection, the model is used to describe the relationship between the predictor vector Z and the response Y. Note that in this modeling, the error η can be rewritten as $\eta = \gamma^\tau U + \varepsilon$ which in effect contains all the removed predictors of U. When the full model is

sparse such that $\gamma \equiv 0$, there are a great number of research works available in the literature to obtain root-n consistent estimation and oracle property, see e.g. the LASSO and the adaptive LASSO (Tibshirani 1996; Zou 2006), the SCAD (Fan and Li 2001; Fan and Peng 2004), the Dantzig selector (Candés and Tao 2007) and its relevant development, and the MCP (Zhang 2010).

However, when Z is correlated with some components of U, the following may occur:

$$E(\eta|Z) \neq 0. \tag{1.3}$$

It implies that model (1.2) could be biased. This problem could appear in two scenarios. First, in most of cases in practice, the full model cannot be exactly sparse. Thus, many "insignificant predictors" with "small but not nonzero" coefficients are removed in selection procedure. However, as Leeb and Pötscher (2005) showed that even when some coefficients are of order $n^{-1/2}$, the conventional model selection consistency may go wrong. Zhang and Huang (2008) also considered the model when there are many coefficients that are small. Under a condition that controls the magnitudes of the small coefficients, several properties about estimation consistency are discussed, but the root-n consistency cannot be ensured either. It is easy to verify that when the coefficients are of the order $n^{-1/2}$, their condition is not satisfied. In other words, in their setting, even when the coefficients that are associated with "insignificant predictors" would have a smaller rate than $n^{-1/2}$, achieving the root-n consistency is still a challenge. Further, a more practical issue is that even when the model is sparse, any variable selection method would miss some "significant predictors" and may cause the working model to be biased. Because of the model bias, it is difficult for the confidence region construction for the coefficients that are associated with the kept predictors in the working model. Also, the prediction accuracy may be deteriorated. These observations motivate us to consider how to consistently estimate θ when the coefficients that are associated with the removed predictors are of slower rate than $n^{-1/2}$ and $E(\eta|Z)$ is not asymptotically negligible.

To the best of our knowledge, none of existing results handle bias correction in the literature.

Of primary interest in the present paper is to correct the model bias for the working model. To correct the bias, our idea is to introduce quasi-instrumental variables for bias correction. Note that those removed predictors may contain the information about the response and the kept predictors in the working model. We then determine some quasi-instrumental variables as functions of these removed predictors. It will be seen that the use of quasi-instrumental variables makes the re-constructed model to be an unbiased partially linear model, which is different in structure from the full model. This partially linear modeling is of course different from the classical partially linear modeling in which the predictors in nonparametric component are given.

We should emphasize the following three points for our study.

- First, if the number of kept predictors is a fixed value, our partially linear modeling can be directly applied. In other words, practically, our method is always feasible.

- Second, for those post-selection models, the number of kept predictors is often random. Thus we should assume the model identifiability for us to do further statistical analyses. As an example, we introduce some regularity conditions under which the working model selected by the Dantzig selector (DS) can be identifiable as the sample size goes to infinity. The same idea can be applied to other variable selection methods such as the LASSO, the SCAD or the MCP with different conditions accordingly. It is worth pointing out that the condition allows small coefficients to tend to zero at a rate of order $n^{(c-1)/2}$ for a constant $0 < c < 1$. This shows the importance of bias correction and remodeling suggested in the present paper because as was commented on the

results from Leeb and Pötscher (2005) and Zhang and Huang (2008), under this setting, existing methods cannot ensure the root-n estimation consistency and asymptotic normality.

- Third, compared with the commonly used estimations for linear models, our method may be more computational intensive. However, to avoid the risk of possible unreliable modeling and analysis caused by bias, the cost is worthwhile to pay.

This work may be a first attempt to achieve the root-n estimation consistency and then reliable further statistical analyses, there are several issues that deserve further investigations. The current version of this paper is an updated version of an early manuscript by Lin, Zhu and Gai (2010).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, when any conventional selection procedures such as the Dantzig selector is used, identifiability conditions are presented, which is particularly designed for the working model when the model size is random, a bias-corrected working modelling is proposed and a method about constructing quasi-instrumental variables is suggested. In Section 3, the estimation and prediction procedures for the new working model are given and the asymptotic properties of the resulting estimation are obtained. In Section 4, an method about how to construct low dimensional nonparametric function is introduced and an approximate algorithm for constructing quasi-instrumental variables is proposed for the case where the dimension of the related nonparametric estimation is relatively large. Simulation studies are presented in Section 5 to examine the performance of the new approach when compared with the classical DS and other methods. The technical proofs for the theoretical results are provided in the online supplement to this article.

2 Identifiability and remodeling

2.1 Identifiability: practical and theoretical consideration

As was discussed in Section 1, when θ in the working model (1.2) is not random, the identifiability is not necessary and our remodeling to remove bias is feasible. However, from the theoretical consideration, existing variable selection approach usually produces a random number of kept predictors in the working model. All existing methods require this random number converges to a non-random constant in a probability sense. Thus, this identifiability issue in our study also asks that the selected coefficient vector θ tends to a non-random vector in a probability sense. This is for theoretical development and the details are presented below.

2.2 Model identifiability

Let $|J|$ be the number of elements in an index set $J \subset \{1, 2, \cdots, p\}$ and $\bar{J}$ be the complement of J in the set $\{1, 2, \cdots, p\}$. For a p-dimensional vector $\delta = (\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_p)^\tau$, denote by $\delta_J = (\delta_j)_{j \in J}$ a sub-vector whose entries are those of δ indexed by J. For the full model (1.1), let I be an index set of "significant regression coefficients" with size $|I| = q$, and $\bar{I}$ be its complement in $\{1, \cdots, p\}$ with size $|\bar{I}| = p - q$. It is worth pointing out that the definition of "significant regression coefficients" here is different from the classical one because if the full model is not exactly sparse, the vector of "insignificant coefficients" with indices in $\bar{I}$ may not be a zero vector. The detail of the definition will be given in Proposition 2.1 later. Thus, as a generic methodology, we will handle biased working model. It is clear that I is usually unknown, and therefore an estimate $\tilde{I}$ of I is required to identify I. We need to assume that $\tilde{I}$ converges to I in a certain sense such that the corresponding working model (1.2) is seen as to be identifiable.

Afterwards, a bias correction can be performed. Clearly, a natural question is how to get an estimate $\tilde{I}$ in practice. When the full model (1.1) is exactly sparse, "significant regression coefficients" are those nonzero coefficients and thus they are well defined. When the full model is not exactly sparse, we must distinguish between "significant regression coefficients" and "insignificant regression coefficients" such that the index set I can be well defined and consistently estimated. For a variable selection procedure, I may be a set $\{1 \leq j \leq p : |\beta_j| \geq \zeta_n\}$ for a positive value ζ_n that may depend on the sample size n. Later, we will present an example using the Dantzig selector to identify such a set. Denote by $\tilde{\beta}_j$ an estimate of the j-th component β_j of the regression coefficient vector β in the full model (1.1) via a selection method such as the LASSO or the SCAD or the Dantzig selector. An estimate of I can be defined as

$$\tilde{I}_{\tau_n} = \{1 \leq j \leq p : |\tilde{\beta}_j| \geq \tau_n\},$$

where $\tau_n > 0$ is a predetermined threshold that will depend on which variable selection approach is applied in the variable selection procedure. The required identifiability condition can be written as:

C0. For the full model (1.1), if there exists a threshold $\tau_n > 0$ satisfying

$$P(\tilde{I}_{\tau_n} = I) \to 1 \ \text{ as } \ n \to \infty,$$

the corresponding working model (1.2) is then called to be identifiable.

Under this condition, $\tilde{I}_{\tau_n} = I$ holds with probability tending to 1. Thus, the working model (1.2) can be non-random in an asymptotic sense. In the following, we use the Dantzig selector as an example to explain the identifiability condition when the model may not be exactly sparse.

Identifiability condition for the Dantzig selector. Denote $\sigma^2 = E(\varepsilon^2|X)$ and let λ_p be the tuning parameter used for constructing the Dantzig selector estimation. We

first suppose without loss of generality that all the diagonal elements of the matrix $\mathbf{X}^\tau\mathbf{X}/n$ are equal to 1. The key idea about the identifiability conditions for the Dantzig selector is to clearly distinguish between the kept predictors and removed predictors whether the full model is exactly sparse or not. The conditions and result are stated in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1 *For the full model (1.1), assume $p = \exp(n^c)$ for a constant $0 < c < 1$ and the following conditions hold:*

$$\begin{cases} \min_{\delta_I \neq 0, \|\delta_{\bar{I}}\|_{\ell_1} \leq \|\delta_I\|_{\ell_1} + c_2 n^{(c-1)/2}} \frac{\|\mathbf{X}\delta\|_{\ell_2}}{\sqrt{n}\|\delta_I\|_{\ell_1}} > \sqrt{c_1}, \\ \min\limits_{j \in I} |\beta_j| \geq c_3 n^{(c-1)/2}, \ \|\beta_{\bar{I}}\|_{\ell_1} \leq c_2 n^{(c-1)/2}, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

and moreover, the regression coefficient vector β is estimated by the Dantzig selector $\tilde{\beta}^D$ with $\lambda_p = 2\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$ and the index set I is estimated by $\tilde{I}_{\tau_n} = \{1 \leq j \leq p : |\tilde{\beta}_j^D| \geq \tau_n\}$ with $\tau_n = c_4 n^{(c-1)/2}$, where positive constants satisfy $c_3/2 > c_4 > \left(4\sigma/c_1 + 3c_2 + \sqrt{8c_2/c_1 + 8\sigma^2/c_1^2}\right)$. Then, as $n \to \infty$,

$$P(\tilde{I}_{\tau_n} = I) \to 1.$$

Remark 1. *It is noted that the inequalities in (2.1) are in sprit similar to those in Bickel et al (2009). However, the key difference is that the minimum is not over all j with $1 \leq j \leq p$ while over a subset I that is often small compared with $\bar{I}$. This condition weaker than that of Bickel et al (2009) plays an important role, otherwise, the $p \times p$ matrix $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^T/n$ is required to be positive definite and when $p > n$, this requirement will not be possible. The separation rate is $n^{(c-1)/2}$ for $0 < c < 1$. When c is large, the corresponding coefficients of the removed predictors can be of the order $n^{(c-1)/2}$. As was commented before, under this condition, any conventional estimation such as the estimation in Zhang and Huang (2010) cannot achieve the root-n consistency.*

The proof of the proposition is given in the supplement. It is worth pointing out that other variable selection methods, such as the LASSO, can also be used as examples for this purpose. But the identifiability condition may be different. The detailed conditions deserve a further study.

2.3 Re-modeling

To correct the bias of the working model (1.2) for constructing a root-n consistent estimate of the sub-vector $\theta = (\theta_1, \cdots, \theta_q)^\tau$, we establish a new model with a quasi-instrumental variable introduced by us. The details are described in this subsection.

As was discussed before, we assume that the q-dimensional significant predictor vector Z is selected into the working model with a probability going to one. From now on we suppose that the dimension q is non-random for simplicity. If q depends on n but is much smaller than n, the method proposed below is still valid. We further assume that

$$\Sigma_{Z,Z} = I_q,$$

where $\Sigma_{Z,Z} = Cov(Z)$ and I_q is a $q \times q$ identity matrix. This assumption is common because the dimension q of the covariate Z in the working model (1.2) is low and furthermore, a standardization over Z does not affect the theoretical development. Our idea is to select some predictors from the removed predictors to define the quasi-instrumental variable. We give its outline below.

1). Re-modeling

Define

$$\tilde{Z} = (Z^\tau, \tilde{U}^\tau)^\tau,$$

where $\tilde{U} = (\Sigma_{U^*,U^*} - \Sigma_{U^*,Z}\Sigma_{Z,U^*})^{-1/2}(U^* - \Sigma_{U^*,Z}Z)$, $\Sigma_{U^*,U^*} = Cov(U^*)$, $\Sigma_{U^*,Z} = Cov(U^*, Z)$ and $U^* = (U^{(k_1)}, \cdots, U^{(k_d)})^\tau$ for some integer $d \geq 1$ when the vectors

U^* and Z are not linearly correlated. Here $U^{(k_1)}, \cdots, U^{(k_d)}$ are d random variables selected from U. The detailed selection method and conditions on $U^{(k_1)}, \cdots, U^{(k_d)}$ will be given in Section 4. Thus, we can see that $\tilde{U}$ is uncorrelated with Z and its covariance matrix is an identity matrix. This leads to an identity matrix as the covariance matrix of $\tilde{Z}$: $\Sigma_{\tilde{Z},\tilde{Z}} = I_{q+d}$. Let $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} = Cov(U, \tilde{Z})$ and denote by r the rank of matrix $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$. Write

$$V = A\tilde{Z},$$

where A is an $r \times (q+d)$ matrix to be be specified later. Suppose that the selected A and $U^{(k_1)}, \cdots, U^{(k_d)}$ satisfy

$$E\{(Z - E(Z|V))(Z - E(Z|V))^\tau\} > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

This condition on the matrix can trivially hold because V is a weighted sum of Z and $U^{(k_1)}, \cdots, U^{(k_d)}$. Condition (2.2) helps identify the following model. Further conditions on A will be discussed later.

Denote $g(V) = E(\eta|V)$. A bias-corrected version of (1.2) is defined as

$$Y = \theta^\tau Z + g(V) + \xi(V), \tag{2.3}$$

where $\xi(V) = \eta - g(V)$. As described above, we must find a vector $V = A\tilde{Z}$ such that $E(\xi(V)|Z, V) = 0$. This appended vector V could be regarded as a quasi-instrumental variable as it is not exactly an instrumental variable for endogenous variable Z in the classical sense. To this end, we must properly select the matrix A. We will discuss it below.

If the quasi-instrumental variable V were given, model (2.3) could be regarded as a partially linear model with a linear component $\theta^\tau Z$ and a nonparametric component $g(V)$, and could be identifiable because of condition (2.2). The model can then still describe the regression relationship between the significant predictors Z and the response Y although a nonparametric function $g(v)$ gets involved.

2). A brief outline of instrumental variable selection.

To determine matrix A, we assume the condition that (Z, U) is elliptically symmetrically distributed. The ellipticity condition can be slightly weakened to be the following *linearity condition*:

$$E(U|C^\tau \tilde{Z}) = E(U) + \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} C(C^\tau \Sigma_{\tilde{Z},\tilde{Z}} C)^{-1} C^\tau (\tilde{Z} - E(\tilde{Z})) \tag{2.4}$$

for some given matrix C. The linearity condition has been widely assumed in the circumstance of high-dimensional models, see Hall and Li (1993). Note that this condition is not very strong because Hall and Li (1993) showed that it often holds approximately when the dimension p is high in the sense that $p \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. This is just the scenario we work on.

Since $\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}} \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ is a symmetric matrix, there exists a $(q+d) \times (q+d)$ orthogonal matrix Q such that $\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}} \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} = Q \Lambda Q^\tau$, where Λ is a diagonal matrix, its first r diagonal elements are positive and the others are equal to zero. Let $Q = (Q_1, Q_2)$ and $Q_1^\tau = (Q_{11}^\tau, Q_{12}^\tau)$, where Q_1 is a $(q+d) \times r$ matrix, Q_{11} is a $q \times r$ matrix and Q_{12} is a $d \times r$ matrix. The following lemma shows that we can find a matrix A such that model (2.3) is always unbiased.

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose that condition (2.4) holds, the eigenvalues of $Q_{11}^\tau Q_{11}$ are not equal to 1, $\Sigma_{Z,Z} = I_q$, and U^* and Z are not linearly correlated. When*

$$A = Q_1^\tau, \tag{2.5}$$

model (2.3) is then unbiased in the sense that $E(\xi|Z, V) = 0$.

Note that in many cases an eigenvalue of $Q_{11}^\tau Q_{11}$ may not exactly equal 1. Thus, the condition on the eigenvalues of $Q_{11}^\tau Q_{11}$ is mild. The proof of Lemma 2.2 is presented in the Supplement. By this lemma, the selected quasi-instrumental variable is

$$V = Q_1^\tau \tilde{Z}. \tag{2.6}$$

We now discuss how to estimate Q_1. It is clear that the matrices Σ_{U^*,U^*}, $\Sigma_{U^*,Z}$ and $\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ are not always given and then need to be estimated. Thus, Q_1 defined in (2.5) and $\tilde{Z}$ in (2.6) need to be estimated. Since the dimensions of the matrices Σ_{U^*,U^*} and $\Sigma_{U^*,Z}$ are much lower than the sample size n, and then they can be consistently estimated, for example by the corresponding sample covariances, and so can Q_1. After Σ_{U^*,U^*} and $\Sigma_{U^*,Z}$ are replaced respectively by their root-n consistent estimates in the expression of $\tilde{Z}$, the estimated value of $\tilde{Z}$ is obtained. Without any notational confusion, we still use $\tilde{Z}$ to denote the estimated value of $\tilde{Z}$. In the matrix $\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$, every element is a sum of $p-q$ summands. We will estimate $\frac{1}{p-q}\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ to have a consistent estimate of Q because of the invariance of Q for $\frac{1}{c}\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ for any positive value $c > 0$. Without loss of generality, assume that Z and U have zero mean. Let $U_1, \cdots, U_n$, $Z_1, \cdots, Z_n$ and $Y_1, \cdots, Y_n$ be the samples of U, Z and Y respectively. Consequently, we get a sample of $\tilde{Z}$ as $\tilde{Z}_1, \cdots, \tilde{Z}_n$. Note that the dimension of $\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ is fixed and $E(\tilde{Z}_1 U_1^\tau U_2 \tilde{Z}_2^\tau) = \Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$. We then use the following U-statistic as an estimate of $\frac{1}{p-q}\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$:

$$\frac{1}{p-q}\widehat{\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}} = \frac{1}{p-q}\frac{2}{n(n-1)}\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\tilde{Z}_i U_i^\tau U_j \tilde{Z}_j^\tau.$$

It is clear that the kernel $h(\tilde{Z}_1, U_1; \tilde{Z}_2, U_2) = \frac{1}{p-q}\tilde{Z}_1 U_1^\tau U_2 \tilde{Z}_2^\tau$ of the above U-statistic has mean $\frac{1}{p-q}\Sigma^\tau_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$. Furthermore, the (i,j)-th component of the kernel is $h_{i,j} = \frac{1}{p-q}\sum_{k=1}^{p-q}\tilde{Z}_1^{(i)}U_1^{(k)}U_2^{(k)}\tilde{Z}_2^{(j)}$, its projection on $(\tilde{Z}_2, U_2)$ is

$$E[h_{i,j}|\tilde{Z}_2, U_2] = \frac{1}{p-q}\sum_{k=1}^{p-q}E[\tilde{Z}_1^{(i)}U_1^{(k)}]U_2^{(k)}\tilde{Z}_2^{(j)}$$

and the variance of the projection is

$$\begin{aligned}
&Var\{E[h_{i,j}|\tilde{Z}_2, U_2]\}\\
&= \frac{1}{(p-q)^2}\sum_{k=1}^{p-q}E^2[\tilde{Z}_1^{(i)}U_1^{(k)}]E[U_2^{(k)}\tilde{Z}_2^{(j)}]^2\\
&+\frac{2}{(p-q)^2}\sum_{k_1<k_2}^{p-q}E[\tilde{Z}_1^{(i)}U_1^{(k_1)}]E[\tilde{Z}_1^{(i)}U_1^{(k_2)}]E[U_2^{(k_1)}U_2^{(k_2)}(Z_2{}^{(j)})^2].
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that if

$$E(U^{(k)}\tilde{Z}^{(j)})^2 \leq C, \quad 1 \leq k \leq p-q, 1 \leq j \leq q+d, \tag{2.7}$$

for a constant $C > 0$, then

$$\frac{1}{p-q}\widehat{\Sigma^{\tau}_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}} - \frac{1}{p-q}\Sigma^{\tau}_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Moreover, there exists a $(q+d)\times(q+d)$ orthogonal matrix $\hat{Q}$ satisfying $\widehat{\Sigma^{\tau}_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}} = \hat{Q}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Q}^{\tau}$, where $\hat{\Lambda}$ is a diagonal matrix, its first $\hat{r}$ diagonal elements are positive and the others are equal to zero. Thus

$$\widehat{\Sigma^{\tau}_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}} = \hat{Q}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Q}^{\tau}.$$

Let $\hat{Q} = (\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2)$ and $\hat{Q}_1^{\tau} = (\hat{Q}_{11}^{\tau}, \hat{Q}_{12}^{\tau})$, where $\hat{Q}_1$ is a $(q+d)\times\hat{r}$ matrix, $\hat{Q}_{11}$ is a $q\times\hat{r}$ matrix and $\hat{Q}_{12}$ is a $d\times\hat{r}$ matrix. Note that when we use $\frac{1}{p-q}\widehat{\Sigma^{\tau}_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}}$, the decomposition is exactly the same: $\hat{Q}\frac{1}{p-q}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Q}^{\tau}$ except for a constant factor $\frac{1}{p-q}$. Because $\hat{Q}\frac{1}{p-q}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Q}^{\tau}$ is a root-n consistent estimate of $\frac{1}{p-q}\Sigma^{\tau}_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$, it is easy to see that

$$\hat{A} = \hat{Q}_1^{\tau}$$

is a consistent estimate of A. By this way, an estimated quasi-instrumental variable can be defined as

$$\hat{V} = \hat{Q}_1^{\tau}\tilde{Z}.$$

From the above choice of A, we can see that $g(v)$ is a r-variate nonparametric function. When r is large, the resulting nonparametric estimate for $g(v)$ is inefficient. We will introduce two methods in Section 4 to reduce the dimension of variable V.

3 Estimation and asymptotic normality

3.1 Estimation

Recall that the bias-corrected model (2.3) can be thought of as a partially linear model and is unbiased when $A = Q_1^\tau$. Then we can design an estimation procedure as follows. Given θ, if A is estimated by $\hat{A}$, then the nonparametric function $g(v)$ is estimated by

$$\hat{g}_\theta(v) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (Y_k - \theta^\tau Z_k) L_H(\hat{V}_k - v)}{\sum_{k=1}^n L_H(\hat{V}_k - v)},$$

where $\hat{V} = \hat{A}\tilde{Z}$ and $L_H(\cdot)$ is a r-dimensional kernel function. A simple choice of $L_H(\cdot)$ is a product kernel as

$$L_H(V - v) = \frac{1}{h^r} K\Big(\frac{V^{(1)} - v^{(1)}}{h}\Big) \cdots K\Big(\frac{V^{(r)} - v^{(r)}}{h}\Big),$$

where $V^{(j)}, j = 1, \cdots, r$, are the components of V, $K(\cdot)$ is an 1-dimensional kernel function and h is the bandwidth depending on n.

With the estimate of $g(v)$, the bias-corrected model of (2.3) can be approximately expressed by the following model:

$$Y_i \approx \theta^\tau Z_i + \hat{g}_\theta(\hat{V}_i) + \xi(\hat{V}_i),$$

equivalently,

$$\hat{Y}_i \approx \theta^\tau \hat{Z}_i + \xi(\hat{V}_i), \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\hat{Y}_i = Y_i - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n Y_k L_H(\hat{V}_k - \hat{V}_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^n L_H(\hat{V}_k - \hat{V}_i)}, \quad \hat{Z}_i = Z_i - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n Z_k L_H(\hat{V}_k - \hat{V}_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^n L_H(\hat{V}_k - \hat{V}_i)}.$$

Thus, the working model in (3.1) results in an estimate of θ as

$$\hat{\theta} = \hat{S}_n^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Z}_i \hat{Y}_i, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\hat{S}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{Z}_i\hat{Z}_i^\tau$. Here we assume that the bias-corrected model (2.3) is homoscedastic, that is $Var(\xi(\hat{V}_i)) = \sigma_V^2$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, n$. If the model is heteroscedastic and $\sigma_i^2(\hat{V}_i) = Var(\xi(\hat{V}_i))$ is assumed to be known, we modify the above estimate to be

$$\hat{\theta}^* = \hat{S}_n^{*-1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2(\hat{V}_i)}\hat{Z}_i\hat{Y}_i,$$

where $\hat{S}_n^* = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2(\hat{V}_i)}\hat{Z}_i\hat{Z}_i^\tau$. When $\sigma_i^2(\hat{V}_i)$ is unknown, we can use its consistent estimate to replace it; for details about how to construct the estimate see for example Härdle *et al.* (2000). In the following we only consider the estimate defined in (3.2). Finally, an estimate of $g(v)$ can be defined as $\hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(v)$.

Also the bandwidth selection is an issue. Because the remodeled model above is a partially linear model, the bandwidth selection for such a model has been sufficiently investigated (see, e.g., Fan and Huang 2005 and Härdle *et al.* 2000). Thus the details are omitted in this paper.

In summary, the algorithm includes the following three steps:

S1. Estimate matrices Σ_{U^*,U^*} and $\Sigma_{U^*,Z}$ by the corresponding sample covariances. Estimate matrix $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}^\tau\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ by the U-statistic given above and decompose the estimated matrix as $\hat{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}}^\tau\hat{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}} = \hat{Q}\hat{\Lambda}\hat{Q}^\tau$ and $\hat{Q} = (\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_2)$.

S2. Calculate $\tilde{Z}$ by replacing Σ_{U^*,U^*} and $\Sigma_{U^*,Z}$ in the expression of $\tilde{Z}$ with their consistent estimates. Choose the estimate of A as $\hat{A} = \hat{Q}_1^\tau$ and construct a quasi-instrumental variable as $\hat{V} = \hat{Q}_1\tilde{Z}$.

S3. Construct the estimate of θ by the formula in (3.2).

The steps show that the new algorithm is slightly more complicated to implement than the ones for linear models are. However, to get the root-n estimation consistency and accurate prediction for non-sparse models, such a cost is worthwhile to pay.

3.2 Asymptotic normality

To study the asymptotic behavior, the following conditions for the model (2.3) are assumed:

C1. The first two derivatives of $g(v)$ and $\xi(v)$ are continuous.

C2. Kernel function $K(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\int K(u)du = 1, \int u^j K(u)du = 0, j = 1, \cdots, m-1, 0 < \int u^m K(u)du < \infty.$$

C3. The bandwidth h is optimally chosen, i.e., $h = O(n^{-1/(2m+r)})$.

C4. The condition (2.7) holds.

Obviously, Conditions *C1-C3* are commonly used for semiparametric models. Condition *C4* is a commonly used moment condition. Furthermore, $Q_1^\tau Q_1 = I_r$ and the condition on eigenvalues of $Q_{11}^\tau Q_{11}$ in Lemma 2.2 implies that $Q_{12}^\tau Q_{12}$ is invertible. Thus, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1 *In addition to the conditions in Lemma 2.2, assume that conditions C1-C4 and (2.2) hold and q is fixed. Then, we have that as $n \to \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \sigma_V^2 (Q_{12}^\tau Q_{12})^{-1}).$$

The proof for the theorem is postponed to the Supplement.

Remark 3.1. From the theorem, we have the following findings:

(1) This theorem shows that the new estimate $\hat{\theta}$ is $\sqrt{n}$-consistent regardless of the choice of the shrinkage tuning parameter λ_p and thus it is convenient to use in practice. Furthermore, by the theorem and the commonly used nonparametric

techniques, we can prove that $\hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(v)$ is also consistent. In effect, we can obtain the strong consistency and the consistency of the mean squared error under some stronger conditions. The details are omitted in this paper. Note that these results can obviously hold when the model is exactly sparse. Thus, our method always ensures the root-n estimation consistency for the coefficients associated with the kept predictors in the working model. On the other hand, the asymptotic covariance of the new estimate relies on the choice of the quasi-instrumental variable V. Similarly as existing approaches in the literature, it is difficult or impossible to choose the optimal instrumental variable for the asymptotic efficiency.

(2) Note that the choice of A is not unique because the choice of $\tilde{Z}$ is not unique. For a dimension reduction choice of A given in the next section, we will have some further theoretical results.

(3) Here we only consider the case where q is fixed for simplicity. It was stated above if q depends on n but is much smaller than n, the method proposed above is still valid. In this case the asymptotic normality for the estimator $\Delta\hat{\theta}$ still holds, where Δ is a $s \times q$ matrix and s is fixed.

3.3 Prediction

Combining the estimation consistency with the unbiasedness of the adjusted working model (2.3), we obtain an improved prediction as

$$\hat{Y} = \hat{\theta}^\tau Z + \hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(V) \tag{3.3}$$

and the corresponding prediction error is

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y-\hat{Y})^2 &= E((\hat{\theta}-\theta)^\tau Z)^2 + E(\hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(V)-g(V))^2 + E(\xi^2(V)) \\ &\quad +2E((\hat{\theta}-\theta)^\tau Z(\hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(V)-g(V))) + 2E((\hat{\theta}-\theta)^\tau Z\xi(V)) \\ &\quad +2E((\hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(V)-g(V))\xi(V)) \\ &= E(\xi^2(V)) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

It is of a smaller prediction error than the one obtained by the classical Dantzig selector, and interestingly any high-dimensional nonparametric estimation is not needed.

In contrast, when we use the new estimate $\hat{\theta}$ and the working model (1.2), rather than the adjusted working model (2.3), the resulting prediction is defined as

$$\hat{Y}_S = \hat{\theta}^\tau Z + \bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}}, \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{g}_{\hat{\theta}}(V_i).$$

We add $\bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}}$ in (3.4) for prediction because the working model (1.2) has a bias $E(g(V))$, otherwise, the prediction error would be even larger. In this case, $\bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}}$ is free of the predictor U and the resultant prediction of (3.4) only uses the predictor Z in the working model (1.2). This is different from the prediction (3.3) that depends on both the low-dimensional predictor Z and a part of the high-dimensional predictors U. Thus (3.4) is a working model based prediction. The corresponding prediction error is

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y-\hat{Y}_S)^2 &= E((\hat{\theta}-\theta)^\tau Z)^2 + E(\bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}}-g(V))^2 + E(\xi^2(V)) \\ &\quad +2E((\hat{\theta}-\theta)^\tau Z(\bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}}-g(V))) + 2E((\hat{\theta}-\theta)^\tau Z\xi(V)) \\ &\quad +2E((\bar{\hat{g}}_{\hat{\theta}}-g(V))\xi(V)) \\ &= E(\xi^2(V)) + Var(g(V)) + 2E(E(g(V))-g(V))\xi(V)) + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This error is usually larger than that of the prediction (3.3). However, we can see that

$$|E(E(g(V))-g(V))\xi(V))| \le (Var(g(V))Var(\xi(V)))^{1/2}$$

and usually the values of both $Var(g(V))$ and $Var(\xi(V))$ are small. Then the prediction error of such a prediction is smaller than that of

$$\tilde{Y}_S = \tilde{\theta}_S^\tau Z, \tag{3.5}$$

which is obtained by the working model (1.2) and the common LS estimate $\tilde{\theta}_S = (\mathbf{Z}^\tau\mathbf{Z})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}^\tau\mathbf{Y}$. Precisely, the corresponding error of $\tilde{Y}_S$ in (3.5) is

$$E(Y - \tilde{Y}_S)^2 \;\; = \;\; E((\tilde{\theta}_S - \theta)^\tau Z)^2 + E(\gamma^\tau U)^2 + \sigma^2 + 2E((\tilde{\theta}_S - \theta)^\tau Z\gamma^\tau U).$$

Because $\tilde{\theta}_S$ does not converge to θ, the values of both $E((\tilde{\theta}_S - \theta)^\tau Z)^2$ and $2E((\tilde{\theta}_S - \theta)^\tau Z\gamma^\tau U)$ are large and as a result the prediction error is large as well.

The above results show that in the scope of prediction, the new method can reduce prediction error under both the adjusted working model (2.3) and the original working model (1.2). We will see that the simulation results in Section 5 coincide with these conclusions.

4 Construction of dimension-reduced variable V

As was mentioned before, when r is large, a r-dimensional nonparametric estimation will be involved, which may lead to inefficient estimation. Thus a low-dimensional quasi-instrumental variable V is desired. In this section, we suggest two alternative approaches.

4.1 Method 1

From Proposition 2.1 we see that to get a low-dimensional variable V, it is sufficient to construct matrix $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ such that its rank r is as small as possible. Assume with no loss of generality that $\|\text{corr}(U^{(1)}Z)\|_{\ell_1} \geq \|\text{corr}(U^{(2)}Z)\|_{\ell_1} \geq \cdots \geq \|\text{corr}(U^{(p-q)}Z)\|_{\ell_1}$.

We then choose U^* as $U^* = (U^{(1)}, \cdots, U^{(d)})^\tau$. Together with the definition of $\tilde{U}$ given in Subsection 2.2, we have

$$\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\Sigma_{U^*,U^*} - \Sigma_{U^*,Z}\Sigma_{Z,U^*})^{1/2} \\ Cov(\bar{U}^*, Z) & Cov(\bar{U}^*, U^*) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\bar{U}^* = (U^{(d+1)}, \cdots, U^{(p-q)})^\tau$. Furthermore, from Lemmas A1 and A2 in the Supplement, we can see that if

$$\gamma^\tau \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} A^\tau (AA^\tau)^{-1} A(\tilde{Z} - E(\tilde{Z})) = \gamma^\tau \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} B^\tau (BB^\tau)^{-1} B(\tilde{Z} - E(\tilde{Z})),$$

model (2.3) is then unbiased, where $B = \begin{pmatrix} I_q & 0 \\ A_1 & A_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $A = (A_1, A_2)$. Intuitively, when $\|\gamma_{d+1}\text{corr}(U^{(d+1)}Z)\|_{\ell_1}, \cdots, \|\gamma_{p-q}\text{corr}(U^{(p-q)}Z)\|_{\ell_1}$ are small enough such that $Cov(\bar{U}^*, Z)$ is small enough, the above equation can be approximately rewritten as

$$\gamma^\tau \tilde{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}} A^\tau (AA^\tau)^{-1} A(\tilde{Z} - E(\tilde{Z})) = \gamma^\tau \tilde{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}} B^\tau (BB^\tau)^{-1} B(\tilde{Z} - E(\tilde{Z})), \tag{4.1}$$

where $\tilde{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ is an approximation to $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ defined by

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (\Sigma_{U^*,U^*} - \Sigma_{U^*,Z}\Sigma_{Z,U^*})^{1/2} \\ 0 & Cov(\bar{U}^*, U^*) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.2}$$

The matrix $\tilde{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ has rank $r = d$. Note that d can be chosen to be small when the correlation between Z and $\bar{U}^*$ is weak and the inequality conditions in Proposition 2.1 hold. Consequently, the resultant V is a low-dimensional variable with dimension $r = d$. In some cases, r can be 1; for details see Remark 4.1 below. By the selected $\tilde{\Sigma}_{U,\tilde{Z}}$, equation (4.1) and the same arguments as in Sections 2, we can get the corresponding orthogonal matrix Q and a solution $A = Q_1^\tau$ as given in Lemma 2.2. To guarantee the asymptotic normality of the corresponding estimate of θ, we need the following condition on the extent of correlation between Z and U:

C5. Suppose $\|\text{corr}(U^{(d+1)}Z)\|_{\ell_1} = O(n^{-\varsigma(d)})$, where $\varsigma(d) \geq 0$ depends on d. The selected d satisfies $\varsigma(d) + \frac{1-c_1}{2} + \frac{m}{2m+d} > \frac{1}{2}$, where $0 < c_1 < 1$ is determined in (2.1) and m is given in *C2*.

This condition is to rue out some cases in which removed predictors have too strong relationship with the kept predictors. The asymptotic normality is stated below.

Theorem 4.1 *In addition to the conditions in Lemma 2.2, assume that conditions C1-C4 and (2.2) hold. When the selected A is a solution of (4.1), the selected d satisfies C5 and q is fixed, then, as $n \to \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{D} N(0, \sigma_V^2 (Q_{12}^\tau Q_{12})^{-1}).$$

Remark 4.1 From Condition *C5*, we have the following findings:

(1) If $0 < c_1 \leq 2\varsigma(d) < 1$ for any d, Condition *C5* always holds for any d. We then simply choose $d = 1$. In this situation, the selected quasi-instrumental variable V is scalar and the nonparametric estimation is only one-dimensional.

(2) For $d \in \mathscr{D}_1 = \{d : 2\varsigma(d) < c_1 < 1\}$, we have

$$d \in \mathscr{D}_2 = \left\{ d : d < \frac{2m - 2mc_1 + 4m\varsigma(d)}{c_1 - 2\varsigma(d)} \right\}.$$

If $\mathscr{D}_1 \cap \mathscr{D}_2$ is nonempty, the optimal choice of d is

$$d^* = \min_d \{d : d \in \mathscr{D}_1 \cap \mathscr{D}_2\}.$$

However, the above arguments only present some theoretical choices for d since it depends on c_1 which describes the inexact-sparsity degree of the model but usually is unknown in advance. Without any prior information about the inexact-sparsity, we suggest the following selection approach.

A selection method for d. Rank the values of $\|\text{corr}(U^{(k)} Z)\|_{\ell_1}, k = 1, \cdots, p-q$, in a descending order $\|\text{corr}(U^{(1)} Z)\|_{\ell_1} \geq \|\text{corr}(U^{(2)} Z)\|_{\ell_1} \geq \cdots \geq \|\text{corr}(U^{(p-q)} Z)\|_{\ell_1}$. We first choose $d_1 = 1$ and construct $U^* = U^{(1)}$. With the choices for d and U^* and the method given in Subsection 2.2, we construct $\tilde{Z}$ and calculate the rank r_1

of matrix $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$. If $r_1 - d_1 \leq 1$, we use $d = d_1 = 1$. If $r_1 - d_1 > 1$, we reselect $d_2 = 2$ and construct $U^* = (U^{(1)}, U^{(2)})^\tau$. Similarly, we further construct $\tilde{Z}$ and calculate the rank r_2 of matrix $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$. Repeat this procedure until that $r_{m-1} - d_{m-1} > 1$ but $r_m - d_m \leq 1$. Consequently, the final choice of d is $d = d_m = m$. The theoretical properties aforementioned ensure that such a choice, $d = m$, is small under Condition *C5*.

4.2 Method 2

If we are uncertain whether the selected d satisfies Condition *C5*, the above dimension-reduced method may not be efficient. We now introduce an approximation to solve this problem. For the convenience of representation, we here suppose $E(Z) = 0$ and $E(U) = 0$. Recall that Lemma A3 given in the Supplement shows that model (2.3) is unbiased if A is a solution of the following equation:

$$\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} A^\tau (AA^\tau)^{-1} A\tilde{Z} = \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} B^\tau (BB^\tau)^{-1} B\tilde{Z}. \tag{4.3}$$

To identify the quasi-instrumental variable V, we only need to identify A. Thus, we suggest an approximation solution of (4.3) with A being supposed to be a row vector; in other words, we only consider row vector solution of equation (4.3). Of course this is not an exact solution but a low dimensional approximation. Without confusion, we still use the notation A to denote this row vector. For definitiveness of the choice of A, we constrain $AA^\tau = 1$. In this case $d = 1$. From Lemmas A1 and A2, and the proof of Lemma 3.2 in the Supplement, we want to choose a row vector A such that

$$A^\tau A\tilde{Z} = \Sigma^+_{U,\tilde{Z}} \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} \tilde{Z}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\Sigma^+_{U,\tilde{Z}}$ is the Moore-Penrose generalized inverse matrix of $\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}}$. By (4.4), A can be constructed as follows. Denote

$$A = (a_1, \cdots, a_q, a_{q+1}),\ A_k = a_k A,\ \Sigma^+_{U,\tilde{Z}} \Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} = (D_1^\tau, \cdots, D_q^\tau, D_{q+1}^\tau)^\tau,$$

where $D_k, k = 1, \cdots, q+1$, are $(q+1)$-dimensional row vectors. Note that $\Sigma^+_{U,\tilde{Z}}\Sigma_{U,\tilde{Z}} = Q_1 Q_1^\tau$. It can be consistently estimated by the method proposed in the previous selection. Then we estimate A via solving the following optimization problem:

$$\inf_{a_k,\cdots,a_{q+1}} \Big\{ Q(a_1, \cdots, a_{q+1}) : \sum_{k=1}^{q+1} a_k^2 = 1 \Big\}, \tag{4.5}$$

where $Q(a_1, \cdots, a_{q+1}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^{q+1} \|(A_k - D_k)\tilde{Z}_i\|^2$. By the Lagrange multiplier, we obtain the estimates of $A_k, k = 1, \cdots, q+1$, as

$$\hat{A}_k = \Big(D_k \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Z}_i \tilde{Z}_i^\tau + c c_k e_k/2 \Big) \Big(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{Z}_i \tilde{Z}_i^\tau + c_k I \Big)^{-1}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $c_k > 0$, which is similar to a ridge parameter, depends on n and tends to zero as $n \to \infty$, and e_k is the row vector with k-th component being 1 and the others being zero. Note that the constraint $\|A\| = 1$ implies $\|A_k\| = \pm a_k$. By combining (4.6) with these constraints we get an estimate of a_k as

$$\hat{a}_k = \pm \|\hat{A}_k\|$$

and consequently an estimate of A is obtained by

$$\hat{A} = (\hat{a}_1, \cdots, \hat{a}_q, \hat{a}_{q+1}).$$

Finally, the estimated quasi-instrumental variable is

$$\hat{V} = \hat{A}\tilde{Z}.$$

5 Simulation studies

In this section we examine the performance of the new methods via simulation studies. By mean squared error (MSE), model prediction error (PE) and their *std* MSE and *std* PE as well, we compare the new methods with the Gaussian-DS first. In

ultra-high dimensional scenarios, the DS cannot work well, we use the sure independent screening (SIS) (Fan and Lv 2008) to bring the dimension p down to a moderate size and then to make a comparison with the Gaussian-DS. As is well known, there are several factors that are of great impact on the performance of variable selection methods: sparse or non-sparse conditions, dimensions p of predictor X, correlation structure between the components of predictor X, and variation of the error which can be measured by theoretical model R-square defined by $R^2 = (Var(Y) - \sigma_\varepsilon^2)/Var(Y)$. Then we will comprehensively illustrate the theoretical conclusions and performances. In the present paper, we only focus on a comparison with the DS because the initial working model is established by the DS in our paper. Clearly, this can also be applied to other methods such as the LASSO, the SCAD or the MCP when the initial working models are selected by them. It deserves a further study.

Experiment 1. This experiment is designed mainly for that with different choices of the theoretical model R-square R^2, we compare our methods with Gaussian-DS. In the simulation, to determine the regression coefficients, we decompose the coefficient vector β into two parts: β_I and $\beta_{\bar{I}}$, where I denotes the set of locations of significant components of β. Three types of β_I are considered:
Type (I): $\beta_I = (1, 0.4, 0.3, 0.5, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3)^\tau$ and I= {1,2,3,4,5,6,7};
Type (II): $\beta_I = (1, 0.4, 0.3, 0.5, 0.3, 0.3, 0.3)^\tau$ and $I = \{1, 17, 33, 49, 65, 81, 97\}$;
Type (III): $\beta_I = (1, 0.4, -0.3, -0.5, 0.3, 0.3, -0.3)^\tau$ and $I = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$.
To mimic practical scenarios, we set the values of the components $\beta_{\bar{I}i}$'s of $\beta_{\bar{I}}$ as follows. Before performing the variable selection and estimation, we generate $\beta_{\bar{I}i}$'s from uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(-0.5, 0.15)$ and the negative values of them are then set to be zero. Thus the model under study here has around 23% of coefficients in $\bar{I}$ are non-zero. In total, there are around 30 nonzero coefficients. Compared with the sample size 50, this number is large. After the coefficient vector β is determined, we consider it as a fixed value vector and regard β_I as the main part of the coef-

ficient vector β. We use $\hat{I}$ to denote the estimate of I. Assume $X \sim N_p(\mu, \Sigma_X)$, where the components of μ corresponding to I are 0 and the others are 2, and the (i,j)-th element of Σ satisfies $\Sigma_{ij} = (-\rho)^{|i-j|}$, $0 < \rho < 1$. Furthermore, the error term ε is assumed to be normally distributed as $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$. In this experiment, we choose different σ to obtain different type of full model with different R^2. In the simulation procedure, the kernel function is chosen to be the Gaussian kernel $K(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\{-\frac{u^2}{2}\}$, and bandwidths for the nonparametric part of the estimation are chosen by the GCV (generated cross-validation). The matrix A is chosen respectively by Method 1 and Method 2 suggested in Section 4. For Method 2, A is determined by (4.6) with $c = 2$, $c_k = 0.2$, $d = 1$ and $U^{(1)}$ being the first component of U. The choice of parameter λ_p in the DS is just like that given by Candés and Tao (2007), which is the empirical maximum of $|X^\tau z|_i$ over several realizations of $z \sim N(0, I_n)$.

The following Tables 1 and 2 report the MSEs, the standard errors (std) of MSE and the corresponding PEs via 200 repetitions with the sample size 50. In the two tables, according to Methd 1 and Method 2, $\hat{\beta}^{(1)}_{\hat{I}}$ and $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}_{\hat{I}}$ are the corresponding estimates by (3.2), $\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$ is based on the Gaussian-dantzig selector. $\hat{Y}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{Y}^{(2)}$ are the corresponding predictions via the adjusted model (3.3), $\hat{Y}^{(1)}_S$ and $\hat{Y}^{(2)}_S$ are in (3.4) with the new estimates $\hat{\beta}^{(1)}_{\hat{I}}$ and $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}_{\hat{I}}$, $\tilde{Y}_S$ stands for the prediction in (3.5). The purpose of such a comparison is to see whether the adjustment works, whether the working model (1.2) should be used when part of the components of high-dimensional data are not available (say, too expensive to collect), and whether the new estimate $\hat{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$ together with the bias-corrected model (2.3) is helpful for promoting prediction accuracy.

Table 1. Simulation results for Experiment 1 with $n = 50, p = 100$ and $\rho = 0.1$

		MSE(stdMSE)			PE(stdPE)				
type	R^2	$\hat{\beta}^{(1)}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{\beta}^{(2)}_{\hat{I}}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{Y}^{(1)}$	$\hat{Y}^{(1)}_S$	$\hat{Y}^{(2)}$	$\hat{Y}^{(2)}_S$	$\tilde{Y}_S$
	0.97	0.0076(0.0290)	0.0083(0.0458)	0.0661(1.0458)	0.3446(0.0852)	0.3236(0.0834)	0.3491(0.0867)	0.3484(0.0867)	1.8019(0.5057)
	0.83	0.0155(0.0529)	0.0178(0.0931)	0.1837(0.2446)	0.7425(0.2062)	0.7338(0.2004)	0.7478(0.2092)	0.7455(0.2098)	1.9524(0.4851)
(I)	0.68	0.0280(0.0915)	0.0322(0.1581)	0.3111(0.3314)	1.3007(0.3370)	1.2728(0.3380)	1.3886(0.3844)	1.3831(0.3848)	3.1355(0.6860)
	0.51	0.0554(0.2166)	0.0528(0.2166)	0.3700(0.2166)	2.5164(0.6858)	2.0656(0.7858)	2.4629(0.5441)	2.4486(0.5334)	3.2328(0.7167)
	0.34	0.1141(0.6882)	0.1098(0.5994)	0.4231(0.5719)	5.6583(1.0436)	4.6131(1.0436)	5.5521(1.4106)	5.4727(1.3625)	5.6865(1.2511)
	0.98	0.0057(0.0246)	0.0062(0.0393)	0.2666(0.0393)	0.2523(0.0717)	0.2544(0.0624)	0.2646(0.0709)	0.2635(0.0705)	2.7789(0.7396)
	0.82	0.0176(0.0727)	0.0202(0.1280)	0.3360(0.3658)	0.9268(0.2431)	0.8748(0.2208)	0.8432(0.3032)	0.8431(0.3057)	3.2786(0.7576)
(II)	0.70	0.0371(0.1680)	0.0410(0.2412)	0.0821(0.2060)	1.8231(0.6182)	1.8211(0.6223)	1.8353(0.4151)	1.8258(0.4169)	2.2044(0.4473)
	0.53	0.0535(0.2347)	0.0590(0.3274)	0.1346(0.3146)	2.4823(0.8481)	2.4203(0.8581)	2.5878(0.8385)	2.5820(0.8333)	3.3047(0.7489)
	0.33	0.1075(0.5257)	0.1127(0.6070)	0.1380(0.5562)	5.4846(1.2681)	5.6176(1.2625)	5.4149(1.3041)	5.3628(1.2690)	5.6352(1.2625)
	0.98	0.0066(0.0247)	0.0066(0.0256)	0.1745(0.5922)	0.2890(0.0721)	0.2728(0.0709)	0.2934(0.0777)	0.2908(0.0760)	8.5007(1.5584)
	0.83	0.0207(0.0960)	0.0218(0.0982)	0.2916(0.3477)	1.1471(0.3021)	0.8076(0.3117)	0.9325(0.2566)	0.9277(0.2574)	3.0455(0.7593)
(III)	0.67	0.0359(0.1738)	0.0330(0.1974)	0.1253(0.2713)	1.8805(0.6640)	1.2958(0.5864)	1.6082(0.5810)	1.5998(0.5777)	2.3560(0.5576)
	0.49	0.0538(0.2525)	0.0587(0.2527)	0.0926(0.2454)	2.7107(0.6603)	2.6685(0.6629)	2.6299(0.6564)	2.6178(0.6584)	2.9190(0.7505)
	0.30	0.1111(0.8190)	0.1173(0.6136)	0.1117(0.5611)	5.5375(1.4581)	5.5381(1.4574)	5.5532(1.5246)	5.5018(1.5131)	5.6872(1.2333)

Table 2. Simulation results for Experiment 1 with $n = 50, p = 100$ and $\rho = 0.7$

		MSE(stdMSE)			PE(stdPE)				
type	R^2	$\hat{\beta}^{(1)}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{\beta}^{(2)}_{\hat{I}}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{Y}^{(1)}$	$\hat{Y}^{(1)}_S$	$\hat{Y}^{(2)}$	$\hat{Y}^{(2)}_S$	$\tilde{Y}_S$
	0.96	0.0212(0.0654)	0.0210(0.0627)	0.3253(0.3440)	0.3817(0.0964)	0.3591(0.1155)	0.3873(0.0978)	0.3802(0.0911)	1.9617(0.4463)
	0.72	0.0426(0.1029)	0.0426(0.1360)	0.7535(0.3552)	0.8480(0.1762)	0.7899(0.1759)	0.7208(0.1760)	0.7057(0.1651)	3.1180(0.6025)
(I)	0.53	0.0413(0.1368)	0.0449(0.1602)	0.2704(0.2870)	1.3493(0.3340)	1.1855(0.4340)	1.2676(0.3513)	1.2424(0.3279)	2.4560(0.6153)
	0.33	0.0710(0.2402)	0.0796(0.2982)	0.1532(0.2356)	2.3931(0.6414)	1.5336(0.6561)	2.2808(0.6312)	2.2595(0.6313)	2.6386(0.6261)
	0.2	0.1506(0.9474)	0.1550(1.0552)	0.1602(0.8273)	5.2751(4.6510)	5.2837(1.3568)	5.2913(1.5935)	5.2669(1.5729)	5.3565(1.4338)
	0.98	0.0138(0.0683)	0.0134(0.0489)	0.2160(0.7071)	0.4884(0.2773)	0.3923(0.1149)	0.4211(0.1153)	0.4192(0.1147)	10.1951(1.8591)
	0.84	0.0228(0.0910)	0.0195(0.1919)	0.1679(0.1977)	0.9586(0.1982)	0.7125(0.2530)	0.8172(0.1837)	0.8142(0.1822)	1.6597(0.3255)
(II)	0.69	0.0445(0.1632)	0.0506(0.3019)	0.2099(0.2525)	1.9009(0.5047)	1.3173(0.5425)	1.7545(0.4501)	1.7358(0.4444)	2.4400(0.5553)
	0.52	0.0619(0.2690)	0.0445(0.1632)	0.2100(0.3414)	2.1641(1.4330)	2.0742(0.9001)	1.9009(1.4047)	1.3173(0.6425)	3.2587(0.8246)
	0.35	0.1190(0.7436)	0.1254(0.8459)	0.1318(0.6574)	6.0371(1.4171)	3.8815(2.1353)	5.3514(1.4601)	5.3077(1.4338)	5.3859(1.3776)
	0.96	0.0222(0.0605)	0.0215(0.0517)	0.2365(0.8033)	0.2907(0.0631)	0.2440(0.0576)	0.2852(0.1162)	0.2572(0.0694)	6.4491(0.7604)
	0.74	0.0382(0.1193)	0.0415(0.1189)	0.5241(0.4315)	0.9856(0.2315)	0.8237(0.2365)	0.8912(0.2612)	0.8366(0.2039)	3.2644(0.7906)
(III)	0.56	0.0539(0.1458)	0.0564(0.2124)	0.1793(0.2335)	1.2743(0.3813)	1.0626(0.3731)	1.2528(0.3534)	1.2182(0.3171)	1.8547(0.4177)
	0.39	0.0748(0.2815)	0.0679(0.3149)	0.2179(0.3525)	2.2543(1.7217)	1.5985(1.1337)	2.4484(0.6324)	2.4401(0.6290)	3.3653(0.8554)
	0.23	0.1308(0.6035)	0.1206(0.4495)	0.1351(0.3674)	4.7107(1.5897)	4.5846(1.8813)	4.5947(1.3848)	4.4944(1.2940)	4.7708(1.0775)

The simulation results in Table 1 suggest that the adjustments of (3.3) and (3.4) work very well in the sense that the corresponding estimates $\hat{\beta}^{(k)}_{\hat{I}}$ and predictions $\hat{Y}^{(k)}$ and $\hat{Y}^{(k)}_S$ $(k = 1, 2)$ are uniformly best than the competitor $\tilde{Y}_S$, and the differences between $\hat{Y}^{(k)}$ and $\hat{Y}^{(k)}_S$ $(k = 1, 2)$ are small. To provide more information, we also

consider the case with higher correlation between the components of X. Table 2 shows that when ρ is larger, the conclusions from the comparison are almost identical to those obtained from Table 1. Thus from the limited simulations we conduct, it concludes that no matter ρ is larger or not, for different choices of R^2, our method works well.

We are now in the position to make another comparison. In Experiments 2 and 3 below, we do not use the data-driven approach as given in Experiment 1 to select λ_p, while manually select several values to see whether our method works or not. This is because in the two experiments, it is not our goal to study shrinkage tuning parameter, but is our goal to see whether the new method works after we have a working model no matter the working model is a "right model" including all "significant predictors" or not.

Experiment 2. In this experiment, our focus is that with different choices of working models and the correlation between predictors, we compare our method with the others. The distribution of X is the same as that in Experiment 1 except for different dimension of X. The coefficient vector β_I is designed as type (I) above and $\beta_{\bar{I}}$ is designed as in Experiment 1. Thus the model here is also non-sparse. Furthermore, the error term ε is assumed to be normally distributed as $\varepsilon \sim N(0, 0.2^2)$.

As different choices of λ_p usually lead to different working models, equivalently, to different estimates $\hat{I}$ of I, we then consider different choices of λ_p in the simulation study. The setting is as follows. For $n = 50, p = 100$ and $\rho = 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7$, we consider two cases for each ρ:
$\rho = 0.1$:
Case 1. $\lambda_p = 3.97$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 }
Case 2. $\lambda_p = 6.53$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={ 1, 2, 3, 4, 25 }
$\rho = 0.3$:
Case 1. $\lambda_p = 3.32$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={ 1, 2, 4 , 5, 6, 7, 20 }

Case 2. $\lambda_p = 6.77$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={ 1, 2, 4, 7, 24 }

$\rho = 0.5$:

Case 1. $\lambda_p = 3.72$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={ 1, 2, 4, 6, 7}

Case 2. $\lambda_p = 7.29$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={ 1, 2, 4 }

$\rho = 0.7$:

Case 1. $\lambda_p = 3.50$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={1, 2, 3, 4}

Case 2. $\lambda_p = 7.22$, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, $\hat{I}$={ 1, 4, 43, 99 }

Table 3. Simulation results for Experiment 2 with $n = 50, p = 100, S = 7$

		MSE(stdMSE)			PE(stdPE)				
ρ	Case	$\hat{\beta}_{\hat{I}}^{(1)}$	$\hat{\beta}_{\hat{I}}^{(2)}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{Y}^{(1)}$	$\hat{Y}_S^{(1)}$	$\hat{Y}^{(2)}$	$\hat{Y}_S^{(2)}$	$\tilde{Y}_S$
0.1	1	0.0078(0.0434)	0.0070(0.0322)	0.3804(1.4008)	0.2556(0.2021)	0.3005(0.0853)	0.3195(0.0861)	0.3187(0.0859)	17.6573(2.6412)
	2	0.0122(0.0464)	0.0120(0.0120)	0.4385(0.4904)	0.5457(0.2353)	0.5379(0.1656)	0.5179(0.1460)	0.5138(0.1428)	3.1373(0.8837)
0.3	1	0.0085(0.0432)	0.0083(0.0364)	0.1679(0.2022)	0.3531(0.1531)	0.2410(0.0832)	0.2685(0.0638)	0.2660(0.0635)	1.6592 (0.3298)
	2	0.0164(0.0671)	0.0145(0.0495)	0.2624(0.2871)	0.4524(0.1784)	0.4468(0.1346)	0.4033(0.1026)	0.4008(0.1020)	1.9283(0.4689)
0.5	1	0.0169(0.0400)	0.0169(0.0420)	0.1099(0.4070)	0.3738(0.1059)	0.2328(0.0637)	0.2626(0.0730)	0.2376 (0.0517)	3.9955(0.5713)
	2	0.0213(0.0421)	0.0220(0.0561)	0.2448(0.6498)	0.5698(0.1132)	0.3591(0.0963)	0.4178(0.1047)	0.3856(0.0885)	7.4154(0.9678)
0.7	1	0.0205(0.0720)	0.0199(0.0874)	0.4473(1.5829)	0.2829(0.0907)	0.2815(0.0695)	0.2981(0.1057)	0.2822(0.0963)	8.2681(1.0685)
	2	0.0194(0.0450)	0.0200(0.0534)	0.1987(0.1364)	0.2986(0.1329)	0.2365(0.0761)	0.2699(0.0676)	0.2618(0.0651)	1.0810(0.2836)

From Table 3, we can see clearly that the correlation is of impact on the performance of the variable selection methods: the estimation gets worse with larger ρ. However, the new method uniformly works much better than the Gaussian DS, when we compare the performance of the methods with different values of λ_p and then with different working models. We can see that in Case I, the working models are more accurate than those in Case II in the sense that they can contain more significant predictors we want to select. Then, the estimation based on the Gaussian Dantzig selector can work better and so can the new method.

In the following, we consider data with higher-dimension.

Experiment 3. In this experiment $\beta_{\bar{I}}$ is designed as in Experiment 1. When $p = 1000$, there are around 230 nonzero coefficients. This number is much larger

than the sample size 100 in this experiment. Thus the model here is also non-sparse. For very large p, the DS method alone cannot work well. Thus, we use the sure independent screening (SIS, Fan and Lv 2008) to reduce the number of predictors to a moderate scale smaller than the sample size, and perform variable selection and parameter estimation afterwards by the Gaussian DS and our adjustment method. Therefore, almost all coefficients after the sure screening are non-zero. This is a very typical non-sparse model with bias.

The experiment conditions are designed as:

$$\beta_I = (1.0, -1.5, 2.0, 1.1, -3.0, 1.2, 1.8, -2.5, -2.0, 1.0)^\tau, n = 100, p = 1000;$$

ρ=0.1:
Case 1. λ_p=4.50, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}, $\hat{I} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9\}$;
Case 2. λ_p=7.30, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}, $\hat{I}$={ 3, 5, 8, 9};
ρ=0.5:
Case 1. λ_p=3.56, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}, $\hat{I} = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$;
Case 2. λ_p=6.92, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}, $\hat{I} = \{2, 5, 8, 9\}$;
ρ=0.9:
Case 1. λ_p=1.80, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}, $\hat{I} = \{1, 2, 5, 9\}$;
Case 2. λ_p=5.83, I={1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}, $\hat{I} = \{1, 5\}$.

With this design, λ_p in Case I results in that more significant predictors are selected into the working model than those in Case II so that we can see the advantage of the adjustment method.

Table 4. Simulation results for Experiment 3 with $n = 100$ and $p = 1000$

ρ	Case	MSE(std MSE)			PE(std PE)				
		$\hat{\beta}_{\hat{I}}^1$	$\hat{\beta}_{\hat{I}}^2$	$\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{Y}^1$	$\hat{Y}_S^1$	$\hat{Y}^2$	$\hat{Y}_S^2$	$\tilde{Y}_S$
0.1	1	0.7354(0.5297)	0.5802(0.4485)	30.2566(18.3643)	6.9334(2.1769)	6.9262(1.9136)	5.6459(1.6411)	5.5941(1.6289)	357.5061(81.1949)
	2	1.2328(1.9193)	1.0982(1.7057)	13.9411(11.0267)	12.5241(6.3322)	12.1051(6.9150)	13.7420(5.0803)	13.5899(5.0010)	363.9597(75.1476)
0.5	1	2.7609(2.6864)	2.2720(1.2278)	57.4401(36.1276)	14.2629(3.9249)	17.7230(4.5973)	12.1683(3.1217)	10.7383(2.3452)	513.6982(69.5787)
	2	6.0680(1.6366)	5.8816(1.9266)	25.0097(17.1664)	16.1536(5.4010)	17.9348(5.2269)	16.8991(4.2717)	15.5496(3.8825)	347.1439(44.3003)
0.9	1	10.0895(5.7459)	9.6210(4.1308)	69.3674(65.3793)	15.2553(4.5103)	12.5484(5.1151)	12.3265(4.3022)	11.2805(3.1104)	349.6882(44.2636)
	2	2.6881(1.6762)	2.5246(1.7219)	16.0189(18.2411)	16.2310(3.4421)	16.5675(3.3055)	13.8226(3.1822)	13.2988(2.8200)	370.0862(35.8113)

From Table 4, we have the conclusion that the SIS does work to reduce the dimension such that the Gaussian DS and our method can be efficiently performed. In the scenarios with small and large correlation coefficients ρ being from 0.1 to 0.9, the new method works better than the Gaussian DS. The conclusions are almost identical to those with smaller p in Experiments 1 and 2. Thus, we do not give more comments here. Further, by comparing the results of Cases I and II, we can see that the adjustment can work better when the working model is not well selected.

Experiment 4. This experiment is used to examine the performance of our method for sparse models. We also consider three types of β which are the same as those in Experiment 1 except that all the components of $\beta_{\bar{I}}$ are zero. The simulation results are reported in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Simulation results for Experiment 4 with sparsity condition and $n = 50$, $p = 100$ and $\rho = 0.3$

		MSE(std MSE)			PE(std PE)				
type	R^2	$\hat{\beta}^1_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{\beta}^2_{\hat{I}}$	$\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$	$\hat{Y}^1$	$\hat{Y}^1_S$	$\hat{Y}^2$	$\hat{Y}^2_S$	$\tilde{Y}_S$
	0.97	0.0011(0.0056)	0.0011(0.0057)	0.0009(0.0040)	0.0501(0.0129)	0.0470(0.0110)	0.0480(0.0134)	0.0479(0.0133)	0.0466(0.0094)
(I)	0.81	0.0161(0.0816)	0.0152(0.0630)	0.0120(0.0366)	0.6252(0.1556)	0.6475(0.1979)	0.6154(0.1692)	0.6126(0.1686)	0.5868(0.1609)
	0.66	0.0318(0.1522)	0.0336(0.1568)	0.0231(0.0914)	1.5207(0.4457)	1.5851(0.5271)	1.4396(0.3857)	1.4344(0.3850)	1.3817(0.3489)
	0.48	0.0589(0.2842)	0.0571(0.2849)	0.0392(0.1529)	2.5454(0.8854)	2.5617(0.9552)	2.4978(0.6834)	2.4859 (0.6812)	2.3777(0.5940)
	0.30	0.1253(0.5924)	0.1155(0.5753)	0.0950(0.4254)	5.3103(1.6553)	5.2178(1.6782)	5.3244(1.2781)	5.2417(1.1567)	5.3643(1.1403)
	0.98	0.0011(0.0053)	0.0011(0.0055)	0.0010(0.0040)	0.0512(0.0121)	0.0461(0.0133)	0.0485(0.0117)	0.0484(0.0116)	0.0467(0.0111)
	0.83	0.0147(0.0669)	0.0143(0.0632)	0.0123(0.0400)	0.6233(0.2892)	0.5885(0.2228)	0.6131(0.1922)	0.6113(0.1924)	0.5914(0.1389)
(II)	0.69	0.0204(0.0967)	0.0184(0.0686)	0.0141(0.0538)	0.8922(0.2691)	0.7506(0.2918)	0.8625(0.1963)	0.8559 (0.1858)	0.8214(0.1710)
	0.51	0.0607(0.4194)	0.0632(0.3031)	0.0376(0.1320)	2.6871(0.8511)	1.9209(0.8912)	2.4965(0.7490)	2.4831(0.7422)	2.3767(0.5534)
	0.32	0.1157(0.6849)	0.1179(0.6243)	0.0920(0.5110)	5.5929(1.4590)	4.9211(1.7027)	5.4506(1.4685)	5.4462(1.4337)	5.2151(1.2803)
	0.98	0.9803×10^{-3}(0.0049)	0.0012(0.0060)	0.0011(0.0044)	0.0600(0.0342)	0.0452(0.0136)	0.0508(0.0130)	0.0505(0.0128)	0.0480(0.0113)
	0.81	0.0161(0.0816)	0.0152(0.0630)	0.0120(0.0366)	0.7352(0.2556)	0.5775(0.1979)	0.6154(0.1692)	0.6126(0.1686)	0.5868(0.1609)
(III)	0.66	0.0318(0.1522)	0.0336(0.1568)	0.0231(0.0914)	1.6207(0.3457)	1.0851(0.5271)	1.4396(0.3857)	1.4344(0.3850)	1.3817(0.3489)
	0.48	0.0589(0.2842)	0.0571(0.2849)	0.0392(0.1529)	2.5454(0.7854)	2.5617(0.9552)	2.4978(0.6834)	2.4859(0.6812)	2.3777(0.5940)
	0.30	0.1253(0.5924)	0.1155(0.5753)	0.0950(0.4254)	5.6103(1.1553)	5.0178(1.0782)	5.3244(1.2781)	5.2417(1.1567)	5.0643(1.1403)

From this table, we can see that even in sparse cases, for every type of β, the new estimate $\hat{\beta}^{(k)}_{\hat{I}}, k = 1, 2$, are in almost all cases better than $\tilde{\beta}_{\hat{I}}$ in the sense of smaller MSE. This is also the case for prediction: $\hat{Y}^{(k)}, k = 1, 2$, have smaller prediction error than $\tilde{Y}_S$ does when $\rho \geq 0.1$. It is not a surprise that $\hat{Y}^{(k)}_S, k = 1, 2$, cannot be as good as its performance in non-sparse cases, but still comparable to $\tilde{Y}_S$. Overall, the new method is still comparable to the classical method in the sparse models under study.

In summary, the results in the six tables above obviously show the superiority of the new estimate $\hat{\theta}$ and the bias-corrected model (2.3)/the working model (1.2) over the others in the literature with smaller MSEs, PEs and standard errors. The good performance holds for different combinations of the sizes of selected working models (values of λ_p), n, p, S, I, R^2 and the correlation between the components of X. The new method is particularly useful when a submodel, as a working model, is very different from underlying true model. Thus, the adjustment method is worthy of recommendation. Also it is comparable to the classical method in sparse cases, suggesting its robustness against model structure. However, as a trade-off, the

adjustment method involves nonparametric estimation, although low-dimensional ones. It makes estimation not as simple as that obtained by existing ones. Thus, we may consider using it after a check whether the submodel is significantly biased. The relevant research is ongoing.

Supplementary Materials.

Proofs of the theorems: The pdf file "supplement-4.pdf" containing detailed proofs of the lemmas and theorems.

Matlab package for DANTZIG CODE routine: Matlab package "DANTZIG CODE" containing the codes. (WinRAR file)

References

Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y. and Tsybakov, A. (2009). Simultaneous analysis of LASSO and Dantzig selector. *Ann. Statist.*, **37**, 1705-1732.

Candés, E. J. and Tao, T. (2007). The Dantzig selector: statistical estimation when p is much larger than n. *Ann. Statist.* **35**, 2313-2351.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.*, **96**.

Fan, J. and Peng, H. (2004). Nonconcave penalized likelihood with a diverging number of parameters. *Ann. Statist.*, **32**, 928-961.

Fan, J., Peng, H. and Huang, T. (2005). Semilinear high-dimensional model for normalized of microarray data: a theoretical analysis and partial consistency. *J. Am. Statist. Ass.*, (with discussion), **100**, 781-813.

Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *J. R. Statist. Soc.* B **70**, 849-911.

Härdle, W., Liang, H. and Gao, T. (2000). *Partially linear models.* Physica Verlag.

Hall, P. and Li, K. C. (1993). On almost linearity of low dimensional projection from high dimensional data. *Ann. Statist.* **21**, 867-889.

Leeb, H. and Pötscher, B. M. (2005). Model selection and inference: facts and fiction. *Econometric Theory*, **21**, 21-59.

Lin, L., Zhu, L. X. and Gai, Y. J. (2010). Adaptive post-Dantzig estimation and prediction for non-sparse " large p and small n" models. *arXiv:1008.1345v1 Stat.ME 7 Aug 2010*, 1 – 37.

Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. Royal. Statist. Soc B.*, **58**, 267 - 288.

Zhang, C. H. (2010), Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of statistics*, **38**, 894–942.

Zhang, C. and Huang, J. (2008). The sparsity and bias of the LASSO selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.*, **36**, 1567-1594.

Zou, H. (2006). The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, **101**, 1418-1429.